

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NAHLAH AL ISA,
O/B/O R.A.A.I.,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:23-CV-11360
Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

v.

COMMISSIONER OF
SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

**OPINION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 13), GRANTING DEFENDANT’S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 14) AND AFFIRMING
THE DECISION OF THE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY**

Plaintiff, Nahlah Al Isa, on behalf of minor R.A.A.I., brings this action under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) for review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying R.A.A.I.’s application for child social security disability benefits. Currently before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 13), the Commissioner’s cross-motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 14), Plaintiff’s reply (ECF No. 15) and the administrative record (ECF No. 7).

The parties have consented to my authority. (ECF No. 9.) A virtual hearing was noticed for July 18, 2024. On that date, both Plaintiff’s counsel (Julie Atkins)

and the Commissioner's counsel (Chad Muir) appeared via Zoom. The Court ruled and gave extensive reasoning in support of its ruling from the bench, affirming the ALJ's decision.

In the end, Plaintiff has not shown legal error that would upend the ALJ's decision, and the Court finds that it is supported by substantial evidence. As explained in greater detail on the record, the Court is satisfied that the ALJ reviewed and considered the entire record and acted well inside the “‘zone of choice’ within which the Commissioner can act without the fear of court interference.” *Buxton v. Halter*, 246 F.3d 762, 772-73 (6th Cir. 2001) (citation omitted). The Court is satisfied that the ALJ adequately considered and sufficiently explained why he found less than marked limitations in the childhood domains of attending and completing tasks and moving about and manipulating objects, that his decision created a logical bridge between the evidence and the result, *Gross v. Commissioner*, 247 F. Supp.3d 824, 829-830 (E.D. Mich. 2017), and that the appellate record permits meaningful review of the ALJ's application of the rules. *Wilson v. Commissioner*, 378 F.3d 541, 544 (6th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, upon consideration of the motion papers and oral argument, and for all of the reasons stated on the record by the Court, which are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully restated herein, Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 13) is

DENIED, Defendant's motion (ECF No. 14) is **GRANTED**, and the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 22, 2024

s/ *Anthony P. Patti*

Anthony P. Patti

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE